## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

| GRAYLIN GRAY,             | ) 4:13CV3026                |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Plaintiff,                | )                           |
| V.                        | ) MEMORANDUM<br>) AND ORDER |
| NEBRASKA DEPARTMENT OF    | )                           |
| CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, et | )                           |
| al.,                      | )                           |
| Defendants.               | )                           |

This matter is before the court on its own motion. On September 18, 2013, the court required Plaintiff to show cause why he is entitled to proceed in forma pauperis ("IFP") pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §1915(g). (Filing No. 14.) The court determined that the following three cases were brought by Plaintiff and dismissed as frivolous: *Gray v. Grammar*, No. 4:95CV3446 (D. Neb.), dismissed as frivolous on April 18, 1996; *Gray v. Smith*, No. 4:95CV3405 (D. Neb.), dismissed as frivolous on March 15, 1996; and *Gray v. Grammar*, No. 4:95CV3404 (D. Neb.), dismissed as frivolous on Feb. 14, 1996. Plaintiff did not file a response to the court's September 18, 2013, Memorandum and Order, nor has he paid the court's \$400.00 filing and administrative fees. Accordingly,

## IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

- 1. Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis (Filing No. 2) is denied.
  - 2. This matter is dismissed without prejudice.
  - 3. Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (Filing No. 12) is denied as moot.

4. A separate judgment will be entered in accordance with this Memorandum and Order.

DATED this 5<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

Richard G. Kopf Senior United States District Judge

<sup>\*</sup>This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.